

REMARKS

In summary, claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a publication (“Web-based Specification and Integration of Legacy Services”, IBM Press 2000), in the name of Zou *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Zou”), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0193471, in the name of Upton.

Zou and Upton, whether considered separately or together, neither disclose nor suggest Applicant’s claimed invention. For example, Zou and Upton, whether considered separately or together, neither disclose nor suggest a “configuration user interface module” that “displays a single unified user interface for interfacing with any adaptor for management and setup of the adaptor, thereby eliminating a need for a user to learn to use multiple user interfaces for adaptors,” as recited in claim 1.

Zou does not teach a single user interface for management and setup of the adaptor, thereby eliminating a need for a user to learn to use multiple user interfaces for adaptors.

Upton appears to be cited for the lack of this structure in Zou; namely that Upton allegedly teaches the proposition and suggestion to utilize a single user interface for management and setup of an adapter. It is respectfully submitted that Upton does not teach or suggest a single user interface. Upton oppositely teaches the use of a plurality of Graphic User Interfaces, or “GUIs”. It is submitted that the application views of Upton are actually a logical view of the data, rather than the consistent single unified user interface as claimed.

Assuming *arguendo*, that the application views are readable as a client interface as claimed, Applicants submit that the Examiner points to particular citations in Upton for teaching of a single user interface for management and setup of an adapter, particularly paragraphs [0043], [0036], and [0033] of Upton.

The “application views” as utilized in the Upton reference do not specify a particular look and feel to a user, but are defined at [0033] as “interfaces” of the respective adapters. Paragraph [0036] substantiates that application views can abstract away much of the complexity of dealing with an application, such as a back end Enterprise Information System (EIS), based on the need for varied abstraction. This would mean that based on varied levels of abstraction, one could have different application views, or interfaces to the ultimate target (EIS). Further, the paragraph states “Each application view can be specific to a single adapter, and can define a set of business functions on that adapter’s EIS. As each application view is specific to a single adapter and can define functions to that particular adapter’s EIS, no teaching or suggestion is made that a single interface or application view is available for management and setup of any particular adaptor.

Paragraph [0043] in Upton teaches of a standards-based architecture, but the framework can also expose application functions and design-time graphical user interfaces (GUIs) used for creating the application views. Upton uses Graphical user interfaces in the plural, implying more than one graphical user interface could be utilized, therefore teaching away from having a single user interface as defined in the present claims.

Further teaching away from a single user interface for management and setup of the adaptors is text in Upton not cited by the Examiner regarding Claim 1, namely Paragraph [0038]. This paragraph teaches of the flexibility of what and how the application view scheme opens the door to a customizable user interface for a specific business need or purpose. Paragraph [0038] continues with “As a result, the application view can provide an effective alternative to the “one size fits all” approach that may applications provide in the design of a client interface.” With this statement, Upton is teaching against a “one size fits all” approach to the application view, or a single user interface as claimed. It is the generalized logical function view, application view as defined, not a single user interface, that is taught in Upton.

And yet further teaching away from a single user interface, Upton envisions using, not only a typical XML coding based language for defining the application views (Upton Paragraph [0037]) in the integration framework, but Upton’s system can also utilize a

business process engine to graphically construct and maintain business processes, Paragraph [0047], for example a business process management (BPM) plug in or the like.

The remarks and arguments provided above with respect to independent claim 1, also apply to independent claims 13 and 21. Taken together and viewed as a whole, Upton does not teach the subject matter missing from Zou, and actually teaches away from an interface module that displays a single unified user interface for interfacing with any adaptor for management and setup of the adaptor, thereby eliminating a need for a user to learn to use multiple user interfaces for adaptors. As Upton does not teach or suggestion such structure, no motivation to combine the references is present and one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, would not have incorporated the nonexistent teachings of Upton into Zou's system. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, of claims 1-21 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2752/302033.01
Application No.: 10/721,002
Office Action Dated: June 8, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

It is requested that the forgoing amendments, arguments, and remarks be entered, and in view thereof, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow this application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: August 29, 2007

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439